

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/659,327

Applicant(s)

ISHII ET AL.

Examiner

Harry D. Wilkins, III

Art Unit

1742

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Harry D. Wilkins, III.

(3) _____

(2) Michael Davis.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 June 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed that one of ordinary skill in the art, upon a full reading of the specification, would have understood, from the data in tables 2 and 4, that the invention included an H/C ratio on an atomic weight basis, as opposed to the molar ratio language utilized in the specification. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known that the use of molar to describe the H/C ratio of the invention was an error. Correction of the specification and claims 1 and 2 to recite "atomic weight ratio" as opposed to "molar ratio" or "weight ratio" will result in withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection.